UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/593,078 09/15/2006		Benjamin J Naden	11801-002-999	6485
20583 JONES DAY	7590 04/01/201	0	EXAM	INER
222 EAST 41S' NEW YORK, N		KASSA, JESSICA M		
NEW TORK, I	N1 1001/		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1616	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/01/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/593,078	NADEN ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
JESSICA KASSA	1616	

	JESSICA KASSA	1616						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED <u>09 March 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.								
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperior Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Comperiors:	the same day as filing a Notice of a replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request					
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection	n.					
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extender 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	f). on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 cension and the corresponding amount of the chortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing dat	36(a) and the appropriate of the fee. The appropriate nally set in the final Office	e extension fee ate extension fee e action; or (2) as					
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the						
AMENDMENTS								
3.  ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, because (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further con (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below)	nsideration and/or search (see NO		cause					
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or			ne issues for					
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1		ected claims.						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324)					
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		mphane / monamene (i						
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	owable if submitted in a separate, t	•	-					
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-18 and 20-27. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		l be entered and an ex	xplanation of					
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>								
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails	s to provide a					
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.					
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ol>		condition for allowan	ce because:					
12.	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)							
	/Ernst V Arnold/							
	Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1616						

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Claim 16 has been amended to a narrower limitation that was not previously presented and requires further search and consideration. New claims 26 and 27 also present a particular combination of polar and non-polar which were previously presented in separate dependent claim.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's amendments have not placed the case in condition for allowance and Applicant's arguments are not persuasive. Applicant asserts that the secondary references do not cure the deficienies of Dransfield with respect to the ratio of polar to non-polar material. Respectfully, the Examiner cannot agree. In the absence of surprising and/or unexpected results, the selection of the particular organic materials from the materials taught by Dransfield, Kessell or Uemura is prima facie obvious. Likewise, optimization of the amounts of those materials is prima facie obvious in the absence of surrprising and/or unexpected results. Applicants argue that none of the references teach the dispersion in new claim 27 and, consequentially the advantages of the instantly claimed invention. However, the combination of the prior art references are taught by the combination of the prior art references. All three references teach metal oxide dispersions; Dransfield teaches isohexadecacne and Uemura teaches 2-ethylhexanoic triglyceride which appears to be a synonym for triethylhexyl triglyceride. Moreover, applicants fail to specify what the advantages of the istantly claimed invention is or to provide any objective evidence for those supposed advantages.